

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 RESIDENTIAL CREDIT SOLUTIONS, INC.,)
11)
12 Plaintiff(s),) 2:17-cv-00084-JCM-NJK
13 vs.) ORDER
14 LV REAL ESTATE STRATEGIC INVESTMENT)
15 GROUP LLC SERIES 5112,) (Docket No. 16)
16 Defendant(s).)
17 _____)

18 Pending before the Court is the parties’ proposed joint discovery plan and scheduling order.
19 Docket No. 16. Under Local Rule 26-1(b)(1), “[u]nless the court orders otherwise, discovery periods
20 longer than 180 days from the date the first defendant answers or otherwise appears will require
21 special scheduling review.” Additionally, “[p]lans requesting special scheduling review must
22 include . . . a statement of the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply to the case.”
23 Local Rule 26-1(a).

24 In this instance, the parties request a 284-day discovery period because, they submit, “counsel
25 for the parties have numerous quiet title actions involving the same or similar issues that were filed
26 within a short time frame.” Docket No. 16 at 2. As the Court has previously explained, that is not
27 good reason to extend the discovery period. *See, e.g., Bank of Am., N.A. v. Premier One Holdings,*
28 *Inc.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. Lexis 146839, at *2 (D. Nev. Oct. 29, 2015); *Greene v. Alhambra Hosp. Med.*
Ctr., 2015 U.S. Dist. Lexis 72697, at *3 (D. Nev. June 3, 2015).

1 Accordingly, the parties' proposed joint discovery plan is hereby **DENIED** without prejudice.
2 The Court **ORDERS** the parties to submit, no later than April 26, 2017, a proposed joint discovery
3 plan that either (1) is based on the presumptively reasonable 180-day period outlined in Local Rule
4 26-1, or (2) provides an adequate explanation why a longer period should be granted.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 DATED: April 19, 2017.

7 
8 _____
9 NANCY J. KOPPE
10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28